

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

Robbie Collins,

Plaintiff,

v.

Nurse Renee Thompson, Nurse Rastelli,  
Nurse Pamberton,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-1208-RMG

**ORDER**

Before the Court is the report and recommendation (“R & R”) of the Magistrate Judge recommending that Plaintiff’s motions for temporary injunction (Dkt. Nos. 25, 27) be denied. (Dkt. No. 39). No written objections were filed by Plaintiff.

**I. Legal Standard**

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with this Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the Report for clear error. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but

instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

## **II. Discussion**

The Magistrate Judge correctly found that Plaintiff’s two motions for temporary injunction were unrelated to the factual allegations set forth in his complaint and, thus, not a proper basis for a preliminary injunction. The Magistrate Judge further correctly found that even if the motions fell within the proper scope of this lawsuit, the motion for preliminary injunction should be denied because Plaintiff fails to meet the requirements of *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 1, 7 (2008).

## **III. Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing, the Court **ADOPTS** the R & R (Dkt. No. 39) as the Order of the Court and **DENIES** Plaintiff’s motions for preliminary injunctions.

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Richard M. Gergel  
Richard Mark Gergel  
United States District Judge

December 23, 2024  
Charleston, South Carolina